



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XL, 3.

WHOLE No. 159.

I.—REFERENCES TO LITERATURE¹ IN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE.

In Plautus and Terence there are many passages which deal with literary or quasi-literary matters. For the most part such references are Greek in origin and character, though we shall find, especially in Plautus, a surprising amount of material bearing on Latin literature rather than on Greek.²

The references fall into two main classes. Of these one deals primarily with the stories³ that form so large a part of Greek literature, especially of Greek dramatic literature.⁴ The other consists of allusions to literary works or literary passages, which are, in general, not named.

¹ I use this term in a very wide sense, to cover some things that might well fall also under such captions as folklore, mythology, and religion. By the time of Menander, Philemon, and Diphilus, and even more by that of Plautus and Terence, such matters had become, in part at least, bookish. Certainly, from the point of view indicated in footnote 3, below, the inclusion here of such matters is warranted.

² This remark applies more fully to matters to be discussed in a later paper, as a continuation of the present discussion. See note 4.

³ Long after the present paper had been begun I found that Professor F. F. Abbott, in his *Society and Politics in Ancient Rome* (1909), 178-179, had sought to infer the intellectual interests and capacities of Plautus's audiences by noting what Greek myths appear in his plays. So Professor J. S. Reid, in his edition of the *Academica* (1885), page 20, uses the allusions to philosophy and the philosophical reflections in the fragments of the Roman drama, tragic and comic, as a means of determining the measure of Roman acquaintance with philosophic matters. He appends three references to Terence, but none to Plautus, a much more important source of information in this connection. See page 248, note 2.

⁴ This class only will be considered in this paper.

In both classes the allusion is frequently, perhaps more commonly, employed for purposes of parody. Further, the effectiveness of the parody is increased by the fact that it is frequently put into the mouth of a slave¹; in the disparity between the sentiments uttered and the status of the speaker lies much of the fun.

Sometimes we need to bring the two classes of allusions into closest relation to each other. Thus, we have numerous allusions in Plautus to the story of the Trojan War and the various matters contained in the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Cyclic Poems*: see e. g. Ba. 925-978 (cf. below, pp. 258-260). Here Latin and Greek works both were in Plautus's mind; the Latin works rather than the Greek were likely to be in the minds of the spectators. In several passages Plautus had specific parts of the *Odyssey*, at least, in mind. The references to matters involving the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Cyclic Poems* (see pp. 254-260) are especially interesting in view of the belief, first securely established in Plautus's time,² in the Trojan origin of the Romans and in view of the predominance of the Trojan War among the themes of Roman tragedy.³

¹ In his paper, *The Ancient Editions of Plautus*, 48, note e, Professor Lindsay wrote thus: "How far Plautus suits his language, his metre, and perhaps his prosody to his characters is a subject that would reward investigation". The present paper shows that there is another question: How far does Plautus, to gain comic effect, fail, on the surface, to adapt the language to his characters, in that he makes them speak of things of which, one would say, they would not naturally speak? Though, we may be sure, some slaves exceeded their masters in culture, slaves must often have been illiterate (witness the freedmen in the *Cena Trimalchionis*, though Professor C. W. Mendell, in a paper entitled *Petronius and the Greek Romance*, in *Classical Philology*, XII, 158-172, denies the realistic character of Petronius's work. For its realistic character see e. g. the two discussions by Professor F. F. Abbott, in *The Common People of Ancient Rome*, 117-144, and in *Society and Politics in Ancient Rome*, 115-130). In a note on *Aristophanes*, *Ranae* 554, Professor Tucker declares that the Greek comic writers do not make vulgar people speak vulgar Attic.

In view of what is written above, I have thought it well to indicate in this paper the rôles played by the speakers of the various passages cited.

² See especially Nettlehip, *The Story of Aeneas's Wanderings*, in Conington's *Vergil*⁴, 2. l-lii.

³ Livius Andronicus wrote an Achilles, an Ajax Mastigophorus, an Aegisthus, and an *Equos Troianus*. See Ribbeck, *Römische Dichtung*²,

I.

A study of the words *graphicus*, *poema*, and *poeta*¹ is not without value for our purposes. Once *graphicus* gives us real help, St. 570.² In 505 ff. Antipho senex has been seeking an invitation to dinner from his sons-in-law; driven to desperation by his failure he has tried the effect of an elaborate *apologus* ('allegory', 'parable': cf. Gellius 2. 29. 1) in 538 ff. At 570 Pamphilippus cries: *Graphicum mortalem Antiphonem! Ut apologum fecit quam fabre!*³

II.

Several references to historical personages may be included here, because their ultimate source is, to some extent at least, bookish.

Agathocles.—In Men. 369 ff. Menaechmus II Syracusanus has denied knowledge of Erotium meretrix; the latter, astounded and hurt by what she tries to regard as a joke,⁴ cries (407 ff.):

Non ego te novi Menaechum, Moscho prognatum patre,
qui Syracusis perhibere natus esse in Sicilia,
ubi rex Agathocles regnator fuit et iterum Pintia,
tertium Liparo, qui in morte regnum Hieroni tradidit,
nunc Hiero est?

1. 17. For Naevius's use of the Trojan War story see Ribbeck again, I. 20, for Ennius's, I. 29. Naevius wrote an *Equos Troianus* and a *Hector Proficiscens*. Half of Ennius's plays dealt with the Trojan cycle. See further e. g. Teuffel, 102; Ribbeck, *Römische Tragödie*, 684; Sellar, *Roman Poets of the Republic*³, 85; Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, 125, 128, 142.

¹ The use of *poema* and *poeta* in Plautus I have discussed fully in *Classical Philology*, XII, 149, and footnote. The suggestion in the footnote, that Plautus at times deliberately used *poeta* in parody of Naevius's proud application of that term to himself, has direct bearing on our present inquiry. In this connection, we may well recall Plautus's reference, in Mi. 208–212, to Naevius's imprisonment. So, too, the discussion in *Classical Philology*, XII, 156–157, of *describo*, *pingo*, *depingo*, *pictor* and *pictura* in Plautus is in point now.

² I use Lindsay's text. The punctuation, capitalization, and at times the spelling are mine.

³ The other examples of *graphicus* (Ep. 410; Ps. 519, 700; Tr. 936, 1024) and of *graphice* (Pe. 306, 464, 843; Tr. 767) do not directly help us.

⁴ For Menaechmus I Epidamniensis as a practical joker and the bearing of that circumstance on this scene and others in the play, see A. J. P. XXXV 27, n. 1.

This is a most amusing jumble of fact and fancy: see Brix-Niemeyer⁵ (1912) and Fowler ad loc. Mr. P. Thoresby Jones, in his edition (1918), is too serious by far when he writes, "Plautus (or his Greek original) is true to life in representing a woman of Erotium's class as guilty of such blunders. An Aspasia was rare." In Ps. 524-530 Pseudolus servos, speaking in burlesque tone, promises a pugnam claram et commemorabilem (525). At 531-532 Simo senex exclaims, si quidem istaec opera, ut praedicas, perfeceris, virtute regi Agathocli antecesseris. In Mo. 775 ff. Tranio servos counts himself as great as Alexander Magnus and Agathocles.

Alexander.—See above, under Agathocles. The foundation of Alexandria by Alexander the Great is perhaps referred to by Gripus servos (piscator) as he builds castles in Spain, Ru. 933a-935a. See below, under Stratonicus.

Antiochus.—In Poe. 693-694 Collybiscus vilicus, masquerading as a miles, says:

Ego id quaero hospitium ubi ego curer mollius
quam regi Antiocho oculi curari solent¹.

Attalus.—In Pe. 339 Saturio parasitus mentions rex Philippos and Attalus. In Poe. 644 ff. the Advocati are telling Lycus leno about the miles, who had that day arrived in Calydon, and wishes *potare, amare* (655-661). Compare now 662-666:

ADV. At enim hic clam, furtim esse volt, ne quis sciat
neve arbiter sit, nam hic latro in Sparta fuit,
ut quidem ipse nobis dixit, apud regem Attalum;
inde nunc aufugit, quoniam capitur oppidum.

CO. Nimis lepide de latrone, de Sparta optume.

Here Plautus takes the pains to tell us (666) that he has been jesting.

¹ The point of these verses is lost to us. Salmasius guessed that the original of the Poenulus was written in the lifetime of Antiochus, and that the latter had had trouble with his eyes. Rost, *Opuscula Plautina* 1. 19, suggested that Antiochus, "mollitiei omni deditus" (so Vissering, *Quaestiones Plautinae* 32), had, for reasons now unknown, given special care to his eyes. Naudet mentions the view of some that favorites of Antiochus were known as his 'eyes' and 'ears'; he refers to Pollux 2. 7. In his *App. Crit.* Leo writes simply: "nihil mollius quam oculos curamus, ut nihil magis quam oculos amamus". The Romans often talked of loving something *magis oculis* or of something as *carius oculis*.

Dareus.—See below, under Philippos.

Hiero.—See above, under Agathocles.

Iason.—In Ps. 173 ff. Ballio leno bids his meretrices bring him profit. One is to bring him stores of grain (188 ff.), *ut civitas nomen mihi commutet meque ut praedicet lenone ex Ballione regem Iasonem* (192–193). On this Calidorus adulescens remarks, to Pseudolus servos (193–194), *Audin? furcifer satin magnificus tibi videtur?* See Professor E. P. Morris, on 193. H. W. Auden, in his annotated edition (1896), reads *Iasionem*, thinking of a Cretan, son of Zeus and Electra, and father, by Ceres, of Plutus. See the article *Iasion* in Pauly-Wissowa, 8. 751–758. Leo, in his text-edition, read *Iasonem*, interpreting of the personage whom Auden calls *Iasion*.

Liparo.—See above, under Agathocles.

Lycurgus.—In Ba. 111 Lydus paedagogus refers to Lycurgus, the law-giver.

Philippus.—See above, under Attalus. In Au. 85–88 Euclio senex says to Staphyla anus: *Mirum quin tua me caussa faciat Iuppiter Philippum regem aut Dareum, trivenefica*. In Au. 701 ff., Lyconidis servos, exulting because he has the miser's *aula*, says, *ego sum ille rex Philippus*. O lepidum diem! The frequent references to the coin called Philippos or Philippeus are more or less in point. J. Egli, *Die Hyperbel in den Komödien des Plautus und in Ciceros Briefen an Atticus*, 3. 18, and Vissering, *Quaestiones Plautinae* 31, hold that the name Philippos, like Croesus, was proverbial for great wealth.

Pintia.—See above, under Agathocles.

Pyrrihus.—In Eun. 781–783 we have a very amusing reference, in a burlesque passage (see from 771), by Thraso miles to Pyrrhus's skill as a strategist.

Seleucus.—In Mi. 75–77 the soldier declares that he has been requested by rex Seleucus to enroll mercenaries for him. In 948–950 he states that he had sent his parasite to take the *latrones* to the king. Seleucia is mentioned several times in the *Trinummus* (112, 771, 845).

Stratonicus.—In Ru. 932 Gripus servos (a piscator), building castles in Spain on the strength of the *vidulus* he had fished

up from the sea, says, *Post animi caussa mihi navem faciam atque imitabor Stratonicum, oppida circumvectabor*.¹

III. ACCHERON; ORCUS.²

Accheron.—In Poe. 71 the prologist declares that the father who had lost Agorastocles, the stolen boy, *ipse abit ad Accheruntem sine viatico*. Naudet interprets *sine viatico* of the lack of the precious things commonly set on the funeral pyre or in or on the tomb, especially of the lack of money needed to pay Charon; for that money compare e. g. such well-known passages as Aristophanes, *Ranae* 141, *Juv.* 3. 265–267, Swift, *The Battle of the Books*, last paragraph.

In Poe. 344 *Adelphasium puella* promises <cum Agorastocle palpare et lalare> quo die Orcus Accherunte mortuos amiserit. This verse has a proverbial ring (reminding one of references to the Greek Kalends) and so has definite connection, perhaps, with literature. Closely akin are the words of *Astaphium ancilla* in *Tru.* 747–750.

Ca. 999–1000 contains an interesting and important reference to paintings of Acheron. See my paper, *References to Painting in Plautus and Terence*, *Classical Philology*, XII, 150.

In *Tr.* 525 *Stasimus servos*, seeking to deter *Philto senex* from accepting the *ager* as a dowry for *Lesbonicus's* sister, if she marries his son, says: *Accheruntis ostium in nostris agro*. With this compare *Ba.* 368, cited below, under *Orcus*.³

¹ Professor Sonnenschein, following Ussing, holds that the reference is to a celebrated musician, contemporary of Diphilus, who travelled about in Greece to exhibit his skill. "Diphilus", he adds, "appears . . . in the original of this play to have indulged in a little light banter of the successful performer Stratonicus". Dousa, however, in the Naudet (Lemaire) edition, thinks that Stratonicus was a "quaestor regis Philippi, et deinde Alexandri Magni", whose wealth passed into a proverb. In any case to Plautus's audience the reference was bookish.

² See notes 1 and 3. Matters of religion, too, were by the time of the New Attic Comedy and the days of Plautus and Terence more or less bookish. The stories figured too in painting: see the discussion, referred to in the text, of Ca. 999–1000, and, perhaps, of the Alcmena story (below, pages 239–242).

³ Less significant are certain other passages. In *Cas.* 159 ff. *Cleustrata matrona* calls her husband *Accheruntis pabulum*. *Accherunticus*, used

Orcus.—For Orcus see first Poe. 344, cited above, page 236. In Ba. 368, Lydus paedagogus calls the house of the Bacchides *ianuam Orci*. Compare Tr. 525, cited in the preceding paragraph. See further As. 606–607 (*adulescens*):

ARG. Vale. PH. Quo properas? ARG. Bene vale: apud Orcum te videbo,
nam equidem me iam quantum potest a vita abiudicabo.

The addition of an explanatory line, wholly Latin, is here natural enough.

In Ca. 282–284 Hegio is questioning Philocrates, whom he takes to be the slave Tyndarus, thus:

HE. Quid pater? vivitne? PH. Vivom, quom inde abimus, liquimus:
nunc vivatne necne, id Orcum scire oportet scilicet.
TY. Salva res est: philosophatur quoque iam, non mendax modo est.

The last verse (on it see further below, page 261, note 1) is justification enough for including in this paper references to Acheron and Orcus.

In Hec. 852–853 Pamphilus *adulescens* says to Parmeno his slave, who had brought him good news,

Egon¹ qui ab Orco mortuom me reducem in lucem feceris
sinam sine munere a me abire?

There may be a reference here to the Orpheus-Eurydice story. In 874–875 Parmeno, tantalized because no one will explain to him the happenings of the play, cries, evidently with the foregoing passage in mind: Tamen suspicor: ego hunc ab Orco mortuom quo pacto . . . !

Other passages, which there is not space here to quote, are Ep. 173–177 (*senex*), 362–363 (*adulescens*), Ps. 795–797 (*leno*).

twice derisively by a *senex* of an old man (Mer. 290–291, Mi. 627–630), has a proverbial ring. In Poe. 428–431, 827–833 gentleman and slave, the latter with special detail, dwell on the number and the varied classes of the dead in Acheron. Kindred to these passages is the reference in Tr. 493–494 by a *senex* to the fact that Acheron is no respecter of persons; there, at least, the rich and the poor are on a par. See, finally, Ba. 199 (*adulescens*), Ca. 689 (*senex*), Cas. 448 (*servos*), Am. 1029 (*Amphitruo dux*), Am. 1078 (*Amphitruo*), Mo. 499 (*Tranio servos* professes to quote the ghost of a gentleman). Note that the words in parenthesis here and elsewhere in like cases give the rôle played by the speaker. See above, page 232, note 1, end.

¹ Sc. *te* as the subject of *abire*, and as antecedent of *qui*.

IV.

A. STORIES APART FROM THOSE RELATING TO THE TROJAN WAR.

Let us consider now the stories to which allusion more or less definite is made. Quite often the allusion is made by an actor as he enters, particularly if he is to occupy the stage for a time *solus*.¹ For convenience of reference the passages are arranged in an alphabetical sequence of story-titles and theme-titles.

Aeacides.—In the *Asinaria* Libanus servos calls attention to the (supposed) Saurea, who is entering at 403 *quassanti capite*, adding (404): *quisque obviam huic occesserit irato vapulabit*. The Mercator rejoins (405-406):

*Siquidem hercle Aeacidinis minis animisque expletus cedit,
si med iratus tetigerit, iratus vapulabit.*

Ajax, Alcumeus.—See below, pp. 238-239. In Ca. 561-563 there is reference (by Tyndarus servos) to three famous madmen of Greek story, Lycurgus, Orestes, and Alcumeus (Alcmaeon). In Ca. 613 ff. there is a very interesting reference to mad Ajax.² See also below, page 241, note 1.

In Cis. 639-644 there is a delicious parody of a suicide scene, which may well have reminded the audience of plays both Greek and Latin, e. g. the Ajax of Sophocles, and the Ajax Mastigophorus of Livius Andronicus.³

In Men. 828-875 is the famous scene in which Menaechmus II Syracusanus, by pretending to be mad, drives off the matrona and her father. The scene is too long to reproduce here. This passage and Ca. 547-616 are to be compared each with the other, in detail, as giving some hints of the diagnosis and pathology of insanity among the Romans. Compare especially Ca. 557 *Viden tu hunc quam inimico vultu intuitur? concedi optumumst*, Hegio: *fit quod tibi ego dixi—gliscit rabies—cave*

¹ The best example is Ba. 925 ff., the passage so excellent in many ways (see below, pp. 258-260). Others are Ru. 83 ff., Pe. 1 ff., 251 ff., Mer. 469, Ru. 593 ff.

² With this passage compare (with Lindsay's note in his annotated edition, on 562) Anacr. 31: *Θέλω, θέλω μανῆναι* 'Εμάλνεν' Ἀλκμαίων τε Χῶ λευκόπους Ὀρέστης, τὰς μητέρας κτανόντες.

³ See Suetonius, Aug. 85, for Augustus's parodic description of the fate of his tragedy, Ajax.

tibi, with Men. 828 Viden tu illic oculos virere? Compare also Ca. 595-596 Viden tu illi maculari corpus totum maculis luridis? Atra bilis agitat hominem, with Men. 829-830 ut viridis exoritur colos ex temporibus atque fronte! ut oculi scintillant vide!

I cannot help connecting these passages with certain characteristics of Ennius's tragic style. Duff, *A Literary History of Rome*, 142, writing of Ennius, well says:

In tragedy the preference of the age was for Greek themes with moving situations, such as the revenge of Medea, the guilt of the house of Atreus, the sacrifice of Iphigenia, and other portions of the Trojan Cycle, comprising in conflict, danger, and bloodshed the requisite appeals to pity and fear.

See Mommsen, *History of Rome*, English Translation, 2. 252; Dimsdale, *A History of Latin Literature*, 22. Scenes of suicide, surely, would be in keeping with such preference. Ennius's fondness for scenes in which some one goes mad is marked; he displays in general a love of the fantastic—for the prophetic frenzy of a Cassandra or the madness of an Alcumeo (this motive had already appeared in both Livius and Naevius). His Ajax, Eumenides, and Athamas all have to do with some form of mental derangement.

If my point here is well taken, it is one of great importance. Vahlen, in discussing the relations between Ennius and Plautus, felt obliged to content himself with a reference to the prologue of the *Poenulus* and to a few passages of Plautus, which, he thinks, show imitation of Ennius. I have not been able, myself, however, to see such imitation in these passages. See my remarks in *American Journal of Philology*, XXXII 16. But if I am right above, we have in the Plautine passages there discussed valuable contemporary evidence on two points: (a) Plautus's relation to Ennius, (b) the general question of Ennius's fame in his own time, a fame and reputation based on work antecedent to the composition, or at least to the publication, of the *Annales*. See further my remarks in *Classical Philology*, XIV, 49-51, with notes, and below, page 258.

Alcmaeon.—See above, under *Ajax*, page 238.

Alcumena.—The *Alcumena* (Ἀλκμήνη) - Amphitruo-Iupiter-Iuno-Hercules story is, of course, omnipresent in the *Amphitruo*. The *Alcumena* story appears again in *Mer.* 690. In

Mer. 667 ff. Dorippa, wife of Lysimachus senex, and Syranus, her attendant, come from the country to town. Syra enters the house and finds there the ancilla that belongs to their neighbor Demipho, the amorous senex. Of course she misunderstands the situation. She hurries out again, and at 689-690 cries to her mistress: *I hac mecum, ut videas simul tuam Alcumenam paelicem, Iuno mea.*

Verses 83-88 of the *Rudens*, spoken by Sceparnio servos as he enters, to begin the play proper, are full of difficulty:

Pro di immortales, tempestatem quouismodi
 Neptunus nobis nocte hac misit proxuma!
 Detexit ventus villam—quid verbis opust?
Non ventus fuit, verum Alcumena Euripidi:
 ita omnis de tecto deturbavit tegulas;
 inlustriores fecit fenestrasque indidit.

Professor Sonnenschein, the latest editor of the *Rudens*, in neither version of his edition (the maior in 1891, the minor in 1901), offers a solution. All he was able to say was this: "The precise point of comparison between the wind and the lost play of Euripides, or the chief character in it, is obscure: the 'tertium quid' may be either violence in general or the unroofing of a building in particular". Nor does the further remark (in the editio maior) that "Hermann suggests that in the original of Diphilus the passage may have run: *τί δ' ἄνεμος; Ἀλκμήνη μὲν ἦν Εὐριπίδου*", explain the point of *Alcumena Euripidi*. Professor Sonnenschein is but reflecting the helplessness of the earlier editors of Plautus; one after the other they repeat, in terms or in substance, Lambinus's suggestion that there was a tragedy of Euripides in which "quum Alcumena pariebat, Jupiter faciebat spurcam tempestatem oriri". Thornton (Translation 2. 272-273) accepts this view, and even goes so far as to conjecture that the Euripidean play in question supplied material for the *Amphitruo*, especially for the more serious parts of the Plautine play. C. S. Harrington, in an edition of the *Captivi*, *Trinummus* and *Rudens*, with very brief notes (1870), took the same view.

Now, if there was a play of Euripides with such a theme, we should at once think in connection with it of Plautus *Amphitruo* 1059 ff., especially 1062 ff., 1094 ff.¹ But for the existence

¹ Nothing is said in this play of *ventus*!

of such a play neither Lambinus nor anyone else has produced any evidence whatever. What has happened is this, I take it: in trying to find some explanation of Sceparnio's words Lambinus thought of the *Amphitruo*, and from that argued for the theme of the Euripidean play Sceparnio had in mind. A good example of *petitio principii*, surely.

In editing Euripides for the Teubner text series Nauck gathered into Volume 3 (1892) the fragments of Euripides. On pages 20-23 he gives 17 citations, aggregating 28 verses, from an *'Αλκμήνη*. Prefixed to this collection is the following note by Nauck: "Omittit hanc fabulam marmor Albanum (C. I. 6047), argumentum ignoramus. Plautus Rudent. 1. 1. 4: *proh di . . . Euripidi*". Clearly Nauck did not question the reading in Plautus. But in the 28 verses of the *'Αλκμήνη* I fail to find anything that in the remotest degree resembles the situation in the *Rudens* or that in the *Amphitruo*.

Our investigation, evidently, has not carried us very far. If we keep the reading *Alcumena* (and there is no variation in the MSS), we are not in position to improve upon Lambinus's view, utterly unsupported though that view is.¹

¹ Nauck, l. c. 14-20, gives 23 fragments of two plays, by Euripides, called *'Αλκμέων* or *'Αλκμαίων*. The fragments aggregate 47 verses, whole or partial. It is clear enough from Nauck, 15, that in both plays the madness of Alcmaeon was in evidence. It would be possible to read in Ru. 86, in place of *Alcumena*, Plautus's form of *'Αλκμαίων*, *Alcumeus*, seen in Ca. 562. For a scribe who had some knowledge of Plautus the thought of the *Amphitruo* might easily have led to the alteration, of *Alcumeus* to *Alcumena*. An allusion to the madness of Alcmaeon (*Alcumeus*) seems more natural and more intelligible by itself in the mouth of one seeking to describe a wild tempest than would be a reference to *Alcumena*, who, in Plautus's *Amphitruo* at least, is the very embodiment of the stately calmness one associates with the Roman *matrona* at her best. As seen above, page 238, the madness of Alcmaeon was proverbial (see under *Aiæx*). Palaeographically, the substitution of *Alcumena* for *Alcumeus* is not inconceivable.

The suggestion made in the foregoing paragraph does far less violence to the MS evidence than is done by the emendation proposed, in *The Classical Review* 27. 159, by Mr. D. A. Slater: "In view of passages like the *Bacchæ*, 576-689 and *H. F.* 874 sqq., it may be felt that some generalization would be more natural in this context, to suggest 'a storm such as blows in the pages of Euripides', rather than the name

When I wrote the above, I overlooked Professor Sonnenschein's discussion in *The Classical Review* 28 (1914), 40-41. He accepts a view, suggested first, apparently, by Engelmann, in 1882, that certain vases, two in number, show scenes or a scene which "must have formed part of the story of the lost play <the Alkmene> of Euripides." These vases display a storm of rain. On the basis of these vases, as interpreted by Engelmann, K. Wernicke, in *Pauly-Wissowa* 1. 1573 (1894), held that in the Alkmene of Euripides Amphitruo planned to burn Alcmene to death, but that the pyre was extinguished by a storm of rain sent by Zeus. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that Engelmann and others rightly interpret the vases (Nauck, *TGF.*², p. 386, refers to Engelmann's paper, and seems to favor his theory), we still need light on the contrast between *ventus* and *Alcumena Euripidi*. When Professor Sonnenschein says, "The story has disappeared from literature; but it has left a trace behind in the allusion which Plautus makes to it in *Rud.* 86," he is writing with less than his usual exactness: what does he mean by "the story"? Again, he stresses the fact that "the particular storm <of the Rudens> *was* <the Italics are his> accompanied by rain; see l. 576 f. . . ." But, in order to get the other member of Plautus's comparison, we need to know *what* it was that, in some play, Euripides mentioned in connection with the Alcmene story that would outdo a *ventus*. This we do not yet know, pace Professor Sonnenschein and the array of scholars he cited in his note.

of a single character (however demented) from a play that had perished". Hence he would read

non ventus fuit verum ruina Euripidi,

taking *ruina* in the sense of 'cataclysm'. He supposes that by haplography the *rum* of *verum* was lost before *ruina*, so that the line became NONVENTUSFVITVERVINA EVRIPIDI. He writes thus: ". . . if we may assume that the allusion was explained by a reference in the margin to the 'Alcumenae filius', it would not be unreasonable to suppose that the editor or corrector reduced the line to metre by interpreting the forlorn A in the text to mean 'Alcumena'". This does violence at once to palaeography and to Plautus's manner, which, surely, is to use names rather than such vague generalities as *ruina* (for proof see the present paper, *passim*). Further, Mr. Slater's suggestions postulate a truly remarkable editor or corrector.

Alcumeus (Alcmaeon).—See above, under *Ajax*, page 238.

Argus (Io).—Au. 551–559 is a most interesting passage. Megadorus senex has sent cooks, etc., into the house of Euclio, his prospective father-in-law (280–360). The latter, desperate with fear for his pot of gold, drove them out with a club (406 ff.). Later he meets Megadorus, and the following dialogue ensues (550–559):

EVC. Pol ego te ut accusem merito meditabar. ME. Quid est?

EVC. Quid sit me rogitas? qui mihi omnis angulos
furum implevisti in aedibus misero mihi,
qui mi intro misti in aedis quingentos coquos
cum senis manibus, genere Geryonaceo;
quos si Argus servet, qui oculus totus fuit,
quem quondam Ioni Iuno custodem addidit,
is numquam servet, praeterea tibicinam,
quae mi interbibere sola, si vino scatat,
Corinthiensem fontem Pirenam potest.

A bookish passage, surely.

Bacchae.—In several places reference is made to the *Bacchae* and their orgies. In part these references reflect common modes of speech (are proverbial), in part they seem to be reflections of contemporary Roman life¹ (in the early part of the second century B. C. the Bacchanalian orgies were giving trouble to the government at Rome: recall the *Senatus Consultum De Bacchanalibus*, and note especially Cas. 980, cited below), in part they seem to me bookish.² I have therefore included them all here.

In Am. 703–705 *Sosia* servos, rebuked by his master *Amphitruo* for agreeing with *Alcumena*, cries:

Non tu scis? *Bacchae* bacchanti si velis advorsarier,
ex insana insaniorem facies, feriet saepius;
si opsequare, una resolvas plaga.

In Au. 408 *Congrio* *cocus*, who has been driven violently forth by *Euclio* senex, cries, neque ego umquam nisi hodie ad *Bacchas*

¹ If this suggestion is correct, we have evidence of Plautus's interest in contemporary life, another case in which he reflects that life. Every proof that Plautus was interested in contemporary Roman life, social, religious, and political, and would and could refer to it, increases the possibility that he referred to contemporary writers and contemporary writings.

² In another paper I shall seek to show that Plautus knew the *Bacchae* of Euripides.

veni in bacchanal coquinatum, ita me miserum et meos discipulos fustibus male contuderunt. Cf. also 411 a. Cas. 978 ff. is even more interesting (the speakers are a senex and two matronae—Lysidamus, Cleustrata and Myrrhina):

CL. Quin responde, tuo quid factum est pallio?

LY. Bacchae hercle, uxor—CL. Bacchae? LY. Bacchae hercle,
uxor—MY. Nugatur sciens,
nam ecastor nunc Bacchae nullae ludunt¹. LY. Oblitus fui,
sed tamen Bacchae—CL. Quid Bacchae?

After this point the play is badly mutilated for some verses.

At Mi. 818 Lurcio puer enters, in answer to Palaestrio's call for Sceledrus, to say that the latter *sorbet dormiens, tetigit calicem clanculum* (823). He describes in comic vein the drinking of Sceledrus, thus (855 ff.):

opera maxuma,
ubi bacchabatur aula, cassabant cadi.
PA. Abi, abi intro iam. Vos in cella vinaria
bacchanal facitis.

Interesting too is Mi. 1015–1016. In 1013 Palaestrio servos describes himself to Milphidippa ancilla as *socium tuorum conciliorum et participem consiliorum*. In 1016 she says: *Cedo signum, si harunc Baccharum es*; one is strongly tempted to render by 'Give the password'. Palaestrio does in fact give the password when he replies at once, *Amat mulier quaedam quendam*.

References in the Bacchides to the Bacchae were of course inevitable. In 53 Pistoclerus adulescens, resisting Bacchis's invitation to enter her house, says, Bacchis, Bacchas metuo et bacchanal tuom. In 368 Lydus paedagogus calls the house of the Bacchides *ianuam hanc Orci*; in 371 he cries, Bacchides non Bacchides, sed Bacchae sunt acerrumae. Cf. 372 ff. Finally, in Men. 835 ff., Menaechmus II Syracusanus, pretending to be mad, cries wildly:

Euhoe atque euhoe², Bromie, quo me in silvam venatum vocas?
Audio, sed non abire possum ab his regionibus:
ita illa me ab laeva rabiosa femina adservat canes.

¹ It is hard not to see here an allusion to efforts by the government to repress the Bacchanalian orgies: see above, page 243.

² That such a passage may rest on books (be parodic), as well as on actual life, can be seen from e. g. Horace, Carm. 2. 19, 3. 25.

The matrona is here thought of as one of the Bacchae. Here, surely, there is travesty of some tragic original: on this whole scene see pp. 238 f. For a reference to the Bacchae which is beyond question bookish, see below, under Pentheus, page 252.

Bellerophon.—In the Bacchides Chrysalus servos carries a letter from Mnesilochus to his father Nicobulus, in which the son had asked his father to keep Chrysalus bound at home (735–747). Nicobulus, having read the letter (790–793), bids Chrysalus wait a moment (794), and goes within his house, to return at 799 with slaves who are to bind Chrysalus. At 809 he explains by showing the letter to Chrysalus¹ and saying, *Em hae te vinciri iubent*. At 810–811 the latter rejoins, with great pretended bitterness: Aha, Bellerophantam tuos me fecit filius: egomet tabellas tetuli ut vincirer.

Circe.—In Epid. 604 Periphanes senex calls the girl whom he had mistakenly supposed to be his daughter *hanc* . . . *Circam Solis filiam*.

Danaides.—In Ps. 101–102 Pseudolus servos says to his master Calidorus:

quod tu istis lacrumis te probare postulas,
non pluris refert quam si imbrim in cribrum geras.

See Lorenz and Morris ad loc. In 369 Pseudolus says *In pertusum ingerimus dicta dolium: operam ludimus*. See Morris here. If the reference in these passages really is to the story of the Danaides, the omission of the name is significant.

Dirce.—In Ps. 196 ff. Ballio leno, threatening Aeschrodora meretrix unless she brings him much profit, says (198–201): *cras te quasi Dircam olim ut memorant duo gnati Iovis devinxere ad taurum, item ego te dstringam ad carnarium: id tibi profecto taurus fiet*.

Eurydice-Orpheus.—See Hec. 852–853, discussed above, page 237, under Orcus.

Ganymedes.—In Men. 110 Menaechmus I Epidamniensis comes out of his house, intending to carry to Erotium meretrix a *palla* which he has stolen from his wife. As he commends himself on his shrewdness in overreaching his wife, Peniculus

¹ Chrysalus servos can read: cf. 1023.

parasitus overhears him and applies for a share of the plunder (135). At 141 ff. this dialogue ensues:

MEN. Vin tu facinus luculentum inspicere? PE. Quis id coxit coquos?
Iam sciam, si quid titubatamst, ubi reliquias videro.

MEN. Dic mi, enumquam tu vidisti tabulam pictam¹ in pariete
ubi aquila Catameitum raperet aut ubi Venus Adoneum?²

PE. Saepe. Sed quid istae picturae ad me attinent?

Menaechmus's allusion is, to be sure, rather far-fetched; he thinks of himself as the eagle or as Venus, of the cloak as Ganymede or as Adonis. But precisely in this, as in the (deliberate) perversion of the name Ganymedes, lies part of the fun of this grandiloquent utterance (see also note 2, below).

There may be another reference to the story of Ganymede, in a corrupt passage, Tr. 946-947. The sycophanta, in a description of his imaginary journeyings, had declared in 940 ff. that he had reached heaven itself. Charmides senex then says: pudicum neminem . . . † re oportet, qui aps terra ad caelum pervenerit.

Geryones.—See above, under Argus, page 243.

Halcyones.—Compare Cas. Prol. 24-26 (a non-Plautine prologue, in part), in an address to the spectators:

Ne quis formidet flagitatorem suum;
ludi sunt, ludus datus est argentariis;
tranquillum est, Alcedonia sunt circum forum.

In Poe. 355-356 Agorastocles adulescens says to his slave Milphio:

¹ On the reference here to painting see my paper, *References to Painting in Plautus and Terence*, *Classical Philology*, XII, 152-153.

² For Venus's love of Adonis see Dümmler, in *Pauly-Wissowa* I. 391-392. Compare especially these words: "Dass das Verhältnis notwendig als bräutliches, keusches aufgefasst worden sei . . . ist nicht als wesentlich für den Kult zuzugeben; die Vorstellung wurde erst durch die hellenistische Kunst begünstigt, die A., ihn mit Eros vermischend, in geradezu unreifem Alter darstellt. Aus einem solchen Bilde macht Plautus Men. I. 2. 34 einen Raub des A. durch Aphrodite. Die alexandrinische Feier <for which see Dümmler 386; cf. Theocr. 15> verbietet, das Verhältnis als platonisch aufzufassen, ganz abgesehen von dem Schmutz der Komödie, welcher keinen echt sagenhaften Hintergrund hat".

Plautus seems, then, to have blundered, whether by accident or by design. A deliberate perversion or confusion would be sufficiently humorous.

Iam hercle tu periisti, nisi illam mihi tam tranquillam facis
quam mare olimst quom ibi alcedo pullos educit suos.

Hercules.—The *Amphitruo* is concerned throughout, of course, with Hercules. For his birth and his feat in strangling the snakes (so well represented e. g. by the well-known fresco in the House of the Vettii at Pompeii) see 1107–1116, a narrative by Bromia ancilla.

In *Pe*. 1–5 *Toxilus servos* says to *Sagaristio servos*:

Qui amans egens ingressus est princeps in Amoris vias
superavit aerumnis is suis aerumnas Herculi,
nam cum leone, cum excetra, cum cervo, cum apro Aetolico,
cum avibus Stymphalicis, cum Antaeo deluctari mavelim
quam cum Amore: ita fio miser quaerendo argento mutuo . . .

In *Epid*. 177–178 *Periphanes senex*, reminded of his dead wife, says:

Hercules ego fui, dum illa mecum fuit,
neque sexta aerumna acerbior Herculi quam illa mihi obiectast.

In *Men*. 199 ff. *Menaechmus I Epidamniensis*, speaking of his theft of a *palla* from his wife, proudly says:

Nimio ego hanc periculo
surrupui hodie: meo quidem animo ab Hippolyta subcingulum haud
Hercules aequae magno umquam apstulit periculo.

In *Ba*. 109 ff. *Lydus paedagogus* seeks to keep his younger master *Pistoclerus* out of the clutches of the *Bacchides*. At 147 *Pistoclerus* says: *Omitte, Lyde, ac cave malo*. *Lydus*, cut to the quick, cries (151 ff.):

LY. Vixisse nimio satiust iam quam vivere.
Magistron quemquam discipulum minitarier!
Nil moror discipulos mi esse iam plenos sanguinis:
valens adffictat me vacivom virium.

PI. Fiam, ut ego opinor, Hercules, tu autem Linus.

LY. Pol metuo magis ne Phoenix tuis factis fuam
teque ad patrem esse mortuom renuntiem.

PI. Satis historiarumst¹.

Lydus keeps the *Linus* story in mind; in 440–441, contrasting contemporary education with that of the good old days, he says: *at nunc prius quam septuennis est, si attingas eum manu, extemplo puer paedagogo tabula dirrumpit caput*.

¹ A very significant word here: compare *Men*. 247–248 and see my remarks in *Classical Philology*, II, 295, n. 1.

In Eun. 1026 ff. Thraso miles refers to the Hercules-Omphale story :

GN. Quid coeptas, Thraso?

TH. Egone? ut Thaidi me dedam et faciam quod iubeat. GN. Quid est? qui minus¹ quam Hercules servivit Omphalae? GN. Exemplum placet.

Utinam tibi conmitigari videam sandalio caput.

The words of the senex in Men. 795-797, as he chides his daughter, are perhaps in point: servirin tibi postulas viros? dare una opera pensum postules, inter ancillas sedere iubeas, lanam carere.

For the Hercules-Phoenix story see Ba. 151 ff. cited above, page 247.

In Cas. 396 ff. we have this dialogue between two slaves :

CH. Deos quaeso—ut tua sors ex sitella ecfugerit.

OL. Ain tu? quia tute es fugitivos, omnis te imitari cupis? utinam tua quidem < tibi > sic, uti Herculeis praedicant quondam prognatis, in sortiundo sors deliquerit.

CH. Tu ut liquescas ipse, actutum virgis calefactabere.

See Naudet's edition here, and Pausanias 4. 3. 3-5, 4. 5. 1, with the notes in the Hitzig-Blümner edition.²

Obscure is Ru. 485-490. There Labrax leno, fresh from shipwreck, exclaims :

† qui homo sese miserum et mendicum volet,†
Neptuno credat sese atque aetatem suam,
nam si quis cum eo quid rei commiscuit,
ad hoc exemplum amittit ornatum domum.
Edepol, Libertas, lepida es, quae numquam pedem
voluisti in navem cum Hercule una imponere.

The commentators have been baffled here. Sonnenschein, in both editions (1891, 1901), merely wrote, "An allusion to some

¹ Sc. Thaidi me dedam.

² This is an extremely interesting passage. One would hardly expect an average audience, Roman or modern, to be familiar with the story of the trickery of Cresphontes and Temenus. This may be true, as has been argued, of others of the allusions cited in this paper. Indeed, it has been maintained "that the very strangeness of many things in the comoedia palliata added to the interest of the plays; the existence of the togata side by side with the palliata lends considerable support to this view" (so Professor A. L. Wheeler, in a review of Leffingwell, *Social and Private Life at Rome in the Time of Plautus and Terence*, which is to appear in *The Classical Weekly*, XIII).

lost myth about Herakles. Lucian (*De mercede conductis*, 23) says that *Libertas* never enters the house of a rich man". The reference to Lucian had been made by Gruter, and, after Gruter, by Leo, in his text-edition (1896). Ussing saw, somehow, a reference to the *Hercules-Omphale* story (for the appearance of that story in Plautus see above, page 248). Professor A. F. West, in *A. J. P.* XV 356, interpreted *Hercules* here and in *Mo.* 984, <Tranio> vel *Herculi* † *conterere quaesum potest* †, as a name for a very rich man. This interpretation he connects with the statement of Sonnenschein, quoted above, about Lucian *De Mercede Conductis* 23. There is, of course, no difficulty in thus interpreting *Hercules*—in the right context: see e. g. Horace, *Serm.* 2. 6. 10–14, and the editors there. Assuming, then, for the moment that Professor West's view of our passage is correct, compare *Au.* 226–235, said by *Euclio senex, pauper*, to *Megadorus senex, vir ditissimus*, his prospective son-in-law:

Venit hoc mihi, Megadore, in mentem, ted esse hominem divitem,
factiosum, me item esse hominem pauperum pauperrimum;
nunc si filiam locassim meam tibi, in mentem venit
te bovem esse et me esse asellum: ubi tecum coniunctus siem,
ubi onus nequeam ferre pariter, iaceam ego asinus in luto,
tu me bos magis hau respicias gnatus quasi numquam siem.
Et te utar iniquiore et meu' me ordo inrideat,
neutrubi habeam stabile stabulum, si quid divorti fuat:
asini me mordicibus scindant, boves incursent cornibus.
Hoc magnum est periculum, ab asinis ad boves transcendere.

But, if this is the thought of *Ru.* 485–490, Lucian *De Mercede Conductis*, 23, is not in point, for nothing is said there to the effect that "*Libertas* never enters the house of a rich man". There to the man who plans to work for pay these words are spoken: καὶ πρῶτόν γε μέμνησο μηκέτι ἐλεύθερον τὸ ἀπ' ἐκείνου μηδὲ εὐπατρίδην σεαυτὸν οἶσθαι· πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα, τὸ γένος, τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, τοὺς προγόνους ἔξω τοῦ ὁδοῦ καταλείψων ἴσθι, ἐπειδὰν ἐπὶ τοιαύτην σαντὸν λατρείαν ἀπεμπολήσας εἰσῆς· οὐ γὰρ ἐθελήσει σοι ἡ Ἑλευθερία ξυνεισελθεῖν ἐφ' οὕτως ἀγεννῇ πράγματα καὶ ταπεινὰ εἰσιόντι. Δοῦλος οὖν, εἰ καὶ πάννυχθ' ὀνόματι, καὶ οὐχ ἑνός, ἀλλὰ πολλῶν δοῦλος ἀναγκαίως ἔσῃ καὶ θητεύσεις κάτω νενευκῶς ἔωθεν εἰς ἐσπέραν, "ἀεκελίῃ ἐπὶ μισθῷ" . . . Plainly, Lucian's words throw light on our passage only by showing that *Libertas* was particular about the company she kept.

Manifestly, no convincing guess concerning the meaning of our passage has yet been made. If another may be added, I would suggest as a sufficient thought here, whether it was that of Diphilus and Plautus or not, the idea that *Libertas* was loath to set foot on shipboard or anywhere else with one so overmastering as *Hercules* had shown himself to be.

In Ru. 798 ff. *Daemones senex* sends *Turbalio servos* to bring from the house two stout *clavae*. When *Turbalio* comes back with the clubs, *Daemones* says (804) *Ehem, optume edepol eccum clavator advenit*; at 807-808 he bids *Turbalio* and *Sparax*, each with a club, to stand on either side of *Labrax leno*, to keep him from molesting the girls and from going away. Finally, when we remember that the scene is laid before a *fanum Veneris*, we shall understand *Labrax's* words at 821 ff.: *Heu hercle ne istic fana mutantur cito: iam hoc Herculi fit Veneris fanum quod fuit: ita duo destituit signa hic cum clavis senex*.

I group here minor references to *Hercules*.—In Cu. 358 *Curculio parasitus* says: *talos arripio, invoco almam meam nutricem Herculem, iacto basilicum*. Between *Hercules*, of the large appetite, and a parasite sympathy was sure to exist. See *Naudet's* note.—In St. 218 ff. *Gelasimus parasitus* is auctioning his property, his *logi ridiculi*. In 221 ff. he cries, *Age, licemini. Qui cena poscit? ecqui poscit prandio? (Hercules te amabit)—prandio, cena tibi. Ehem, adnuistin?* But the text here is uncertain: see *Lindsay*. The passage closes with 232-233: *Haec veniisse iam opus est quantum potest, uti decumam partem Herculi polluceam*. See *Naudet's* note. For tithes to *Hercules* see also Ba. 663-666 (*servos*), Mo. 984 (? *servos*), and, best of all, Tru. 559-565 (*servos*).—In Ru. 1225, *Daemones senex*, having been worsted by *Trachalio servos* in their duel of *licet's*, exclaims, *Hercules istum infelicet cum sua licentia*.

Hippolyta.—See above, page 247, under *Hercules*.

Hyacinthus.—In Ba. 109 ff. *Lydus paedagogus* seeks to deter *Pistoclerus adulescens* from entering *Bacchis's* house. Finally, in 137 ff., we have this dialogue:

PI. Tace atque sequere, Lyde, me. LY. Illuc sis vide!
non paedagogum iam me, sed Lydum vocat.

PI. Non par videtur neque sit consentaneum,
 quom † haec intus † sit et cum amica accubet,
 quomque osculetur et convivae alii accubent,
 praesentibus illis paedagogus ut siet.

Havet, according to Lindsay, suggested, in verse 140, cum παῖς intus sit et cum cum amica accubet. Lindsay himself thinks that quom Hyacinthus intus sit may be right, but he does not indicate wherein a reference to Hyacinthus would be appropriate here. He was doubtless thinking of the erotic version of the Hyacinthus story.

Icarus.—In Mer. 486–489 Naudet saw a reference to the story of Icarus:

EU. Visne eam ad portum—CH. Qui potius quam voles? EU. atque eximam

mulierem pretio? CH. Qui potius quam auro expendas? EU. Unde erit?

CH. Achillem orabo aurum mihi det Hector qui expensus fuit.

EU. Sanun es?

Charinus is throughout sarcastic. The ultimate sense of the passage is as follows: 'Do you want me to go (walk) to the harbor ———?' 'No, fly.'—'and get the woman by paying for her?' 'Why, of course, buy her'. 'Where's the money to come from?' 'Oh, I'll ask Achilles to give me the money he got as ransom for Hector'. Charinus's two answers mean in the last analysis: 'of course you've got to walk, *you* can't fly', and 'pay for her, in gold, of course'. The allusion to the Achilles story increases somewhat the possibility that Naudet is right in seeing a reference to the Icarus story: the allusions that concern us come *catervatim*, so to say; see e. g. above, page 243, under Argus, the passages referred to page 238, note 1, and below, pages 258–260, under Ulixes.

Linus.—See above, under Hercules, page 247.

Lycurgus (insanus).—See above, under Ajax, page 238.

Medea, Pelias.—In Ps. 790–865 Ballio leno is abusing a cocus whom he has hired *a foro*. The latter, unruffled, bids Ballio stop worrying, adding (868 ff.) sorbitione faciam ego hodie te mea item ut Medea Peliam concoxit senem, quem medicamento et suis venenis dicitur fecisse rusus ex sene adulescentulum: item ego te faciam. See the editors ad loc., especially Morris.

Minerva.—In Hau. 1035–1037, in a dialogue between Clitipho adulescens and Chremes, his father, there is an interesting use of the story of Minerva's birth:

CL. Non sunt haec parentis dicta. CH. Non, si ex capite sis meo natus, item ut aiunt Minervam esse ex Iove, ea causa magis patiar, Clitipho, flagitiis tuis me infamem fieri.

Mulciber.—See below, under Achilles, page 255.

Nerio.—In Tru. 515 Stratophanes miles, entering, addresses Phronesium meretrix thus: Mars peregre adveniens salutatur Nerienem uxorem suam. See Gellius 13. 21, especially 11 ff.

Oedipus.—In Andr. 194 Davus servos, pretending not to understand the hint his master is trying to give him, says Davus sum, non Oedipus. In Poe. 443–444 Milphio says of his master's wild utterances, isti quidem hercle orationi Oedipo opust coniectore, qui Sphingi interpretis fuit.

Omphale.—See Eun. 1026 ff., Men. 795 ff., cited above, under Hercules, page 248.

Ops.—In Mi. 1082 the miles says: postriduo natus sum ego, mulier, quam Iuppiter ex Ope natust. Compare Cis. 512 ff., where Alcesimarchus adulescens says, with interruptions by Melaenis lena:

itaque me Iuno regina et Iovis supremi filia,
itaque me Saturnus eius patruos—ME. Ecastor pater.

AL. itaque me Ops opulenta, illius avia—ME. Immo mater quidem.

The Miles passage helps us to see that *eius* and *illius* refer to Jupiter. In Pe. 251 ff. Sagaristio servos, entering, appeals to *Iovi opulento, incluto, Ope gnato*, etc. Brix, on Mi. l. c., refers to Livy 39. 22. 4, and the editors there. See also Preller-Jordan, *Römische Mythologie* ³, 2. 20 ff.

Orestes.—See above, page 238.

Orpheus-Eurydice.—See above, under Orcus, page 237.

Pentheus.—In Mer. 469 Charinus adulescens, entering, says: Pentheum diripuisse aiunt Bacchas: nugas maxumas fuisse credo, praeut quo pacto ego divorsus distrahor. Cf. also a fragment, incomplete, of the *Vidularia*: Eiusdem Bacchae fecerunt nostram navem Pentheum.

Phaon.—In Mi. 1246–1247 Palaestrio servos says to the miles: nulli mortali scio optigisse hoc nisi duobus, tibi et Phaoni Lesbio, tam mulier se ut amaret.

Philomela, Progne.—In Ru. 593 ff. Daemones senex, entering, soliloquizes concerning a dream of the past night (596–

597). A *simia* had been trying to reach a *nidus hirundinus*, but in vain; finally it had sought to borrow a ladder from *Daemones* (598–602). Compare now 603 ff.: ego ad hoc exemplum simiae respondeo . . . natas ex Philomela ac Progne esse hirundines: ago cum illa ne quid noceat meis popularibus.¹ See also, below, on this page, under Tereus.

Phoenix.—See above, under Hercules, page 247.

Phrixus.—In Ba. 239–243 Chrysalus servos refers in a very interesting way to the story of the *aries Phrixi* (*extexam* ego illum pulchre iam, si di volunt, in 239 paves the way very naturally for 241–242).

Porthaon.—In Men. 745 Menaechmus II Syracusanus, addressing the matrona, says: Ego te simitu novi cum Porthaone. Cf. his words to her at 748: Novi cum Calcha simul.

Rhadamanthus.—In Tr. 928 the sycophanta, master supreme of tall talk, when asked to give Charmides's whereabouts, says: Pol illum reliqui ad Rhadamantem in Cercopio. See Brix and Fairclough ad loc.

Sibulla.—In Ps. 25–26 Pseudolus servos says of the letter written by the meretrix to Calidorus adulescens: has quidem pol credo nisi Sibulla legerit, interpretari alium potesse neminem.

Sisyphus.—In Eun. 1084–1085 Gnatho parasitus has the Sisyphus story in mind: Unum etiam hoc vos oro, ut me in vestrum gregem recipiatis: satis diu hoc iam saxum vorso. The *saxum* is the miles. See Donatus and Fabia ad loc.

Sphinx.—See above, under *Oedipus*, page 252.

Tereus.—See under Philomela, Progne, pages 252 f. In Ru. 508–509 Charmides senex, the voluptuous Sicilian friend of Labrax leno, says to Labrax: Scelestiozem cenam cenavi tuam quam quae Thyestae quondam aut posita est Tereo.

Thyestes.—See above, under Tereus.

Titanes.—In Pe. 26 Toxilus servos asks: Quid ego faciam? disne advorser? quasi Titani cum is belligerem quibus sat esse non queam? ²

¹ Compare the appeal of Epops in Aristophanes, *Aves* 366–368 to the birds to spare Peisthetaerus and Euelpides, τῆς ἐμῆς γυναικὸς ὄντε ξυγγενεὶ καὶ φυλέτα.

² In Men. 853 f. Menaechmus II Syracusanus, pretending to be mad, says, Hau male illanc amovi: < amoveo > nunc hunc inpurissimum,

Volcanus.—In Ru. 761 Labrax leno, after *Daemones* has forbidden him to touch the maidens, says: *Volcanum adducam*, is *Venerist advorsarius*. For the story he has in mind compare e. g. *Odyssey* 8. 270–365. See Naudet's note. See also above, under *Mulciber*, page 252.

Miscellaneous Matters.—In Pe. 549 ff. *Sagaristio servos* is talking to the *virgo* whom he is bringing in as a supposed prisoner of war; he asks her opinion of Athens and receives a clever answer (549–550). In 553–554 we have this further dialogue: *SAG. Ut munitum muro tibi visum oppidumst? VI. Si incolae bene sunt morati, id pulchre moenitum arbitror*, etc. There may be a reference to Sparta and its human walls. In Tr. 547–552 there is an elaborate reference to the *Fortunatorum Insulae*. In As. 34, in the words of *Libanus servos*, *apud fustitudinas, ferricrepinas insulas*, I see a parodic reference again to these Islands.

B. STORIES RELATING TO THE TROJAN WAR (INVOLVING HOMER AND THE CYCLIC POETS).¹

Attention was called, p. 232, n. 3, to the rôle played by the story of Troy in early Roman tragedy. Comedy, too, was interested in this theme. At any rate, we find in Plautus (though not in Terence) references repeatedly to well-known details of the story still to be seen in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, but which, in the days when the so-called Cyclic Poems were yet extant, was far more fully rounded out for both Greeks and Romans than it can be for us.

Achilles.—In Tru. 730–731 *Astaphium ancilla* says to *Diniarchus adulescens*: *Stultus es qui facta infecta facere verbis postules. Theti' quoque etiam lamentando pausam fecit filio.*

barbatum, tremulum *Titanum* qui cluet Cycno patre. So Lindsay, and Brix-Niemeyer⁵, with the MSS, rightly. Most editors read *Tithonum* for *Titanum*. But they are obliged to admit that nowhere else is *Tithonus* son of *Cycnus*. This consideration would, of course, be without weight if the MSS gave *Tithonum*; in this very play, 141–143, as shown above, page 246, note 2, we have a story without parallel in extant classical literature.

¹To get the properly cumulative effect, it has seemed best to group under this one caption all the pertinent material.

Epid. 29-38 is a very interesting passage. Two slaves are talking, Thesprio, slave of Stratippocles, who has just come back from Thebes from some campaign, and Epidicus:

EP. Ubi arma sunt Stratippocli?

TH. Pol illa ad hostis transfugerunt. EP. Armane? TH. Atque quidem cito.

EP. Serione dici' tu?

TH. Serio, inquam: hostes habent.

EP. Edepol facinus inprobum. TH. At iam ante alii fecerunt idem¹. Erit illi illa res honori. EP. Qui? TH. Quia ante aliis fuit².

Mulciber, credo, arma fecit quae habuit Stratippocles:

travolaverunt ad hostis³. EP. Tum ille prognatus Theti sine perdat: alia adportabunt ei Neri filiae.

Id modo videndum est, ut materies suppetat scutariis, si in singulis stipendiis is ad hostis exuvias dabit⁴.

In Mi. 59 ff. Artotrogus parasitus tells how the day before some women had questioned him concerning the miles. Cf. 61 ff.:

AR. Rogitabant: "Hicine Achilles est?", inquit mihi.

"Immo eius frater"⁵, inquam, "est". Ibi illarum altera

"Ergo mecator pulcher est" inquit mihi,

"et liberalis. Vide caesaries quam decet".

Cf. also 68. In Mi. 1054a, 1055 Milphidippa ancilla calls the soldier Mi Achilles . . . urbicae, occisor regum. In Mi.

¹ Leo and Lindsay rightly keep the MS order of the verses.

² Gray ad loc. holds that "this probably alludes to some well-known persons who had undeservedly received promotion. They are the *βυψάσπιδες* of Aristophanes, Nub. 353, Pax 1186". Scaliger and Naudet had held this view long before: see the note in the Lemaire edition. Certainly the passage sounds definite enough; it would at any rate be far more effective if aimed at contemporary events. In that case, see above, page 243, note 1, page 244, note 1.

It strikes me, however, that we may have here after all rather a parody of passages like those in Archilochus, Alcaeus, and Anacreon to which Horace's famous phrase, *relicta non bene parmula*, C. 2. 7. 10, goes back. See Smith's note there.

³ The sense is 'No human workman made those arms: they had wings'. There is here, of course, a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* joke; Vulcan made arms for Achilles (and for Aeneas) for *fighting*, not for *flighting*, if the *lusus verborum* may be allowed.

⁴ For the language cf. Juvenal 3. 310-311.

⁵ Wild burlesque, of course; Achilles had no brother. In the Iliad Achilles is long-haired, and *ξανθός*. See Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, 175-177.

1284 ff. Pleusicles adulescens, entering in the disguise of a *naucclerus*, moralizes on the strange conduct to which love has driven men, himself included. At 1289, he begins his enumeration of these things with the words *Mitto iam ut occidi Achilles civis passus est*. See *Mer.* 486 ff., discussed above, under *Icarus*, page 251.

Alexander (Paris).—In *Mi.* 777–778 *Palaestrio servos* says of the miles, *Isque Alexandri praestare praedicat formam suam*. See also below, pages 259–260, the analysis of the contents of *Ba.* 925 ff.

Autolycus.—In *Ba.* 275 *Nicobulus senex* refers to *Autolycus*, grandfather of *Ulysses*, *furacitate celeberrimus*, thus: *Deceptus sum: Autolyco hospiti aurum credidi*.

Calchas.—In *Men.* 748–749 the dialogue between the *matrona* and *Menaechmus II Syracusanus* runs thus (she refers to her father):

MA. Novistin tu illum? MEN. Novi cum Calcha simul:
eodem die illum vidi quo te ante hunc diem.

Cf. his words at 745, *Ego te simitu novi cum Porthaone*. In *Mer.* 945, after *Charinus*, crazed by love, had told *Eutychus* that he had traveled in search of his lost love to *Chalcis* and there had got information concerning her from a *hospes Zacyntho* (940–944), the latter exclaims, *Calchas iste quidem Zacynthiust*.

Hecuba.—*Hecuba's* story, in one detail at least, was in *Plautus's* mind in several passages. Witness the interesting dialogue in *Men.* 713–718 between the *matrona* and *Menaechmus II Syracusanus*, in which *Menaechmus* refers to the story of *Hecuba's* transformation into a dog (for which cf. e. g. *Euripides, Hecuba* 1265). Cf. 936. Possibly, too, *Plautus* had this story in mind in *Cas.* 317–320 (dialogue between *Lysidamus senex* and *Olumpio servos*):

LY. Quid istuc est? quicum litigas, Olumpio?
OL. Cum eadem qua tu semper. LY. Cum uxori mea?
OL. Quam tu mihi uxorem? quasi venator tu quidem es,
dies atque noctes cum cane aetatem exigis.

Yet *cane* in 320 may be merely a common term of opprobrium and 319–320 may remind us rather of *Horace C. i. i.* 25–28.

For another reference to Hecuba see below, pages 259–260, in the discussion of Ba. 925 ff.

Hector.—In Cas. 991 ff., when Olumpio vilicus turns on his master, Lysidamus senex, this dialogue ensues :

LY. Non taces? OL. Non hercle vero taceo. Nam tu maxumo
me opsecravisti opere Casinam ut poscerem uxorem mihi
tui amoris caussa. LY. Ego istuc feci? OL. Immo Hector Ilius—
LY. te quidem oppresset¹.

The Teubner text had printed *Immo Hector Ilius te quidem opprescit*, and had distributed the dialogue differently; the sentence *Immo . . . opprescit* was allotted to Cleustrata matrona. Lindsay refers to Palmer, *Hermathena* 12. 83. Lindsay's text and distribution of parts are excellent. Olumpio starts to say, sarcastically, 'No, I didn't do it, Trojan Hector <did it>'. The sarcasm is of a piece with that seen e. g. in Men. 748–749 MA. Novistin tu illum? MEN. Novicum Calcha simul: eodem die illum vidi quo te ante hunc diem. See also Men. 745 Ego te simitu novi cum Porthaone. For another reference to Hector see above, under Icarus, page 251.

Iphigenia.—In Epid. 488–490 there is probably a reference, in the dialogue between the miles and the senex, to the Iphigenia story:

MI. Em istic homo te articulatim concidit, senex,
tuo' servos. PE. Quid 'concidit'? MI. Sic suspiciost,
nam pro fidicina haec cerva supposita est tibi.

See Gray ad loc.

Nestor.—In Men. 934 ff. the Medicus and the senex talk thus about Menaechmus II Syracusanus:

MED. Nunc homo insanire oceptat: de illis verbis cave tibi.
SE. Immo Nestor nunc quidem est de verbis, praeut dudum fuit.

Penelope.—In St. 1–9 there is a most elaborate reference to Penelope's sorrow because of the long absence of Ulysses (the speaker, Panegyris, has heard nothing of her husband in more than two years: see 29–36): Credo ego miseram fuisse Penelopam, soror, suo ex animo, quae tam diu vidua viro suo caruit, nam nos eius animum de nostris factis noscimus, quarum viri hinc ap sunt, quorumque nos negotiis apsentum, ita ut aequom est, sollicitae noctes et dies, soror, sumus semper.

¹ This sort of interruption is frequent in the Casina.

Talthybius.—In St. 274 ff. Pinacium, rather tipsy¹ (270 ff.), is bringing good news to his mistress. In 305 ff. he cries, *contundam facta Talthubi contemnamque omnis nuntios simulque ad cursuram meditabor me ad ludos Olumpios*.

Ulixes.—In plays in which the chief rôle is borne by the tricky slave we should naturally expect references to Ulixes.²

In Ba. 21–23, among the fragments of this play, we have a reference to the sorrows of Ulixes, particularly to the sorrows caused by his wanderings (the words are spoken, apparently, by one of the Bacchides):

Ulixem audiui fuisse aerumnosissimum
qui annos viginti errans a patria afuit;
verum hic adulescens multo Ulixem anteit < fide >
qui ilico errat intra muros civicos³.

In Ba. 925–978 there is a long parody, in general of many Greek and Latin plays portraying the fall of Troy and its consequences, in particular, I suspect, of Ennius; the parody is uttered by Chrysalus servos. In this Ulixes has a place more than once. Compare 940 ff.: *Ego sum Ulixes, quouis consilio haec gerunt*; 946 miles Menelaust, ego Agamemno, idem Ulixes Lartius; 949 ff. *nam illi* (=adv., 'there,' i. e. at Troy) *itidem Ulixem audiui, ut ego sum, fuisse et audacem et malum: dolis ego deprensus sum, ille mendicans paene inventus interit, dum ibi exquirat fata Iliorum; adsimiliter mi hodie optigit; vinctus sum, sed dolis me exemi: item se ille servavit dolis; 962 ff. ibi vix me exsolvi: atque id periculum adsimilo, Ulixem ut praedicant cognitum ab Helena esse proditum Hecubae; sed, ut olim ille se blanditiis exemit et persuasit se ut amitteret, item ego dolis me illo extuli e periculo et decepi senem*. Cf. p. 239.

¹ See the discussion of this passage in my paper, *References to Painting in Plautus and Terence*, *Classical Philology*, XII, 151–152.

² On this conception of Ulixes as a feature of Greek tragedy see Conington, *Vergil*,⁴ 2. xxxvi. Such a conception, of course, suited the Romans as descendants of the Trojans: see Conington, *ibid.* xxiv–xxvii.

³ The passage is cited by Charisius, to illustrate *ilico* (the word seems to mean 'forthwith', i. e. even before he leaves his patria). *fide* in 23 is due to Leo; Lindsay reads it, but doubtfully. I have not been able to see how the word can be fitted into the context. What we need is a dissyllabic word meaning 'wandering' or 'trouble'. Professor Paul Nixon, in his text and translation (1916), omits *fide*: evidently to him too it was meaningless. For the passage as a whole compare St. 1–9, quoted above, under Penelope, page 257.

In Ps. 1063-1064 Simo senex, entering, says: Visso quid rerum meus Ulixes egerit, iamne habeat signum ex arce Ballionia. Pseudolus, of course, is here Ulixes, and the signum (the Palladium) is the girl owned by Ballio. Again, in 1243-1244, Simo says of Pseudolus: Nimis illic mortalis doctus, nimis vorsutus, nimis malus; superavit dolum Troianum atque Ulixem Pseudolus.¹

In Men. 899 ff. Menaechmus I Epidamniensis, for whom things have turned out badly, entering, says: Edepol ne hic dies pervorsus atque advorsus mi optigit: quae me clam ratus sum facere, omnia ea fecit palam parasitus qui me complevit flagiti et formidinis, meus Ulixes, suo qui regi tantum concivit mali.²

I group here several very general references. In Mi. 1025 Milphidippa ancilla calls the soldier Ilium, thus: quo pacto hoc Ilium appelli velis, id fero ad te consilium. So in the fine parody in Ba. 925 ff. the senex of the play is referred to as *Ilium* (945, 948, 972), and as *Priamus* (978). In Mi. 740 ff. Pleusicles adulescens, praising Periplecomenus senex for his hospitality, declares that usually when a guest is three days together at one's house *east odiorum Ilias* (743). In Tru. 482 ff. Stratophanes miles, entering, declares that he will not, as many others have done, recount his battles: scio ego multos memoravisse milites mendacium: et *Homerionida* et postilla mille memorari potest, qui et convicti et condemnati falsis de pugnis sient (see also the following lines).³

Finally, as the climax of this paper, I take up again a passage to which I have already often referred, Ba. 925-978, the best of all parodies in Plautus, spoken by Chrysalus servos. It is impossible to do this passage justice. Lack of space forbids the

¹ I think at once of Livius Andronicus's line: Virum mihi, Camena, insece vorsutum. On this verse see my remarks in A. J. P., XXXV 17-19; XXXIX 109.

² Brix-Niemeyer⁸ think here of Ulixes's "üble Dienste bei Iphigeniens Opferung (Eurip. Iph. Aul. 524. 1361), wodurch die Verfeindung zwischen Agamemnon und seiner Gattin entstand".

³ I am reminded here of the Greek debate on the question, Is the absolute truth to be demanded of the poet? See W. R. Hardie, *Lectures on Classical Subjects*, 267-268, 283. Plautus's words are interesting, too, when put beside what is said—e. g. by Cicero and Gellius—of the liberties accorded to rhetoricians: compare Gellius, N. A. i. 6. 4-5.

quotation of the whole (it is reinforced by later allusions in the play: see 979 ff.) ; to discuss in detail every point raised by it would be at once too lengthy and needless. Some indication of the richness of this passage for our purposes may, however, be afforded even by a bare catalogue of the names which appear within it: Achilles, 938; Agamemnon, 946; Alexander (=Paris), 947; Atridae, 925; Epius, 937; Hecuba, 963; Helena, 948, 963; Ilium, 945, 948, 951, 956, 972 (987); Menelaus, 946; the Palladium, 954, 958; Pergamum, 926, 933 (1053, 1054); Priamus, 926, 933, 973, 976, 978; Sinon, *relictus . . . in busto Achilli*, 937; Sinon's fire-signal, 939; Troia, 933 (1053, 1058); Troilus, 954, 960; Ulixes, 940, 949-952, 962-965; the 1000 ships, 928; the wooden horse, 936, 941; the tria fata of Troy, 953 ff., 959 (987); the breaking through of the *portae Phrygiae limen superum*, 955 (987).

V. REFERENCES TO PHILOSOPHERS.

Socrates, Solon, Thales.—In Ps. 464-465 Simo senex, speaking to Callipho senex, says of Pseudolus servos: Conficiet iam te hic verbis ut tu censeas non Pseudolum, sed Socratem tecum loqui. See Morris ad loc. The tone here is not so plainly sarcastic as is that of the references to Thales (see below). In As. 598-600 Libanus servos says sarcastically of his younger master Argyrippus: Audin hunc opera ut largus est nocturna? nunc enim esse negotiosum interdus videlicet Solonem, leges ut conscribat quibus se populus teneat. Witness the following dialogue, from Ba. 120-124, between Pistoclerus adulescens and Lydus paedagogus:

LY. An deus est ullus Suavisaviatio?

PL. An non putasti esse umquam? O Lyde, es barbarus¹:
quem ego sapere nimio censui plus quam Thalem,
is stultior es barbaro poticio . . .

In Cap. 274-276 Tyndarus servos, commenting on the interview between Hegio and Philocrates, exclaims: Eugepae! Thalem talento non emam Milesium, nam ad sapientiam huius <hominis> nimius nugator fuit. In Ru. 1003 two slaves, Trachalio, and Gripus, talk thus: TR. Stultus es. GR. Salve,

¹ For the lusus verborum here cf. Cu. 150.

Thales. In 986 Gripus had already derisively addressed Trachalio with the word *Philosophe*.¹

CHARLES KNAPP.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

¹ For a similar reference to Thales in Greek comedy see e. g. Aristophanes, *Aves* 1009 *ἄνθρωπος θαλῆς* (said of Meton). See the editors there, especially Van Leeuwen. The tone in all the references in Plautus to Socrates, Solon, and Thales, it will be noted, is sarcastic. We may compare other passages in which there is allusion to philosophy, though no philosopher is named. In Cap. 284 Tyndarus, overhearing Philocrates's remark about Orcus (see above, page 237), says: *Salva res est: philosophatur quoque iam, non mendax modo est*. To Tyndarus, *philosophia* was the quintessence of lying. Cf. also *Mer.* 147-148 (*Acanthio servos*): *Nescio ego istaec: philosophari* ('refine', 'split hairs') *numquam didici neque scio*; *Ps.* 687 (*Pseudolus servos*, who had been philosophizing since 675) *Sed iam satis est philosophatum: nimi' diu et longum loquor*; *Ps.* 974 (*Pseudolus*, commenting on his master's remark, in *foro vix decumus quisque est qui ipse sese noverit*) *Salvos sum, iam philosophatur*.

It would be easy, especially in view of passages in Cicero's works (e. g. *De Fin.* 1. 1) which show Roman opposition to philosophy, and in view of the still more significant fact that Cicero repeatedly makes elaborate apologies for devoting himself to philosophy (see Reid, *Academica*, 23, note), to suppose that in the passages cited in this note Plautus was reflecting Roman rather than Grecian views of philosophy. But let us recall how in *Anabasis* 2. 1. 13, in answer to Theopompus's labored effort to show why the Greeks should not surrender their arms to the King, Phalinus *ἔγχελασε καὶ εἶπεν*, 'Ἀλλὰ φιλοσόφῳ μὲν *ἔοικας, ὦ νεανίσκε, καὶ λέγεις οὐκ ἀχάριστα. Ἰσθι μέντοι ἀνόητος ὢν, εἰ οἶει τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀρετὴν περιγενέσθαι ἂν τῆς βασιλέως δυνάμεως*.